



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,186	06/26/2003	Cezary Marcjan	MS301534.01/MSFTP685US	7627

27195 7590 04/02/2009
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
127 Public Square
57th Floor, Key Tower
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

MURRAY, DANIEL C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2443

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

04/02/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/609,186	Applicant(s) MARCJAN, CEZARY	
	Examiner DANIEL C. MURRAY	Art Unit 2443	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 FEB 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-19, 21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-19, 21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2443

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 23FEB2009 has been entered.

2. **Claims 16 and 20** have been canceled by Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1, 3, 6-10, and 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Kenyon et al. (US Patent # US 6,792,430 B1)**.

a) Consider **claims 1**, Kenyon et al. clearly show and disclose, a method of sharing computer objects (abstract, column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49, lines 54-67, column 2 line 1, column 4 lines 3-8, column 5 lines 26-29), comprising: storing in computer memory, association information relating to one or more associations (column 4 lines 3-8, column 7 lines 10-15) between a selected object in a

Art Unit: 2443

first computer space and one or more first objects in the first computer space, wherein the association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between the user and the objects in the first computer space (abstract, column 2 lines 14-24, column 3 lines 31-40, column 4 lines 11-23 lines 28-36, column 5 lines 26-30, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 16-24), and wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts or communications (digital information objects, documents, files)(abstract, column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49 lines 66-67, column 2 line 1, column 4 lines 3-6, column 8 lines 32-36); sharing the selected object (documents, emails, shared network files)(column 8 lines 32-36) and the association information from the first computer space with a second computer space, the second computer space including one or more of the second objects that match the one or more first objects (column 1 lines 62-65, column 3 lines 34-40, column 7 lines 10-15); identifying in the second computer space the one or more second objects in the second computer space (column 1 lines 62-65, column 3 lines 34-40, column 5 lines 14-29, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 10-15); and automatically forming the one or more associations (inherent from the teachings of Kenyon et al. since keywords defining overlays (i.e. associations) are contained in the document and they are transferred with the document when shared and the overlay is downloadable and can be made available globally)(column 5 lines 14-29, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 10-15) between the selected object and the second objects preexisting in the second computer space upon the sharing of the selected object and the association information from the first computer space to the second computer space (column 3 lines 34-40, column 5 lines 14-29, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 10-15).

b) Consider **claim 10**, Kenyon et al. clearly show and disclose, computer readable storage media that facilitate forming context associations between first and second objects that are stored in computer memory and are associated with each other based on user computer interactions (abstract,

Art Unit: 2443

column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49, lines 54-67, column 2 line 1, column 4 lines 3-8, column 5 lines 26-29), the computer readable storage media comprising: instructions for storing in memory association information relating to one or more associations (column 4 lines 3-8, column 7 lines 10-15) between a selected object in a first computer space and one or more first objects in the first computer space, wherein the association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between the user and the objects in the first computer space (abstract, column 2 lines 14-24, column 3 lines 31-40, column 4 lines 11-23 lines 28-36, column 5 lines 26-30, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 16-24); instructions for sharing the selected object (documents, emails, shared network files)(column 8 lines 32-36) and the stored association information from the first computer space with a second computer space, the second computer space including one or more second objects that are respectively identical to one or more of the first objects (column 1 lines 62-65, column 3 lines 34-40, column 7 lines 10-15); instructions for identifying in the second computer space the one or more second objects (column 1 lines 62-65, column 3 lines 34-40, column 5 lines 14-29, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 10-15); and instructions for automatically creating one or more associations between the selected object and the one or more second objects in the second computer space (inherent from the teachings of Kenyon et al. since keywords defining overlays (i.e. associations) are contained in the document and they are transferred with the document when shared and the overlay is downloadable and can be made available globally)(column 3 lines 34-40, column 5 lines 14-29, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 10-15).

c) Consider **claim 3 and 12**, and **as applied to claim 1 and 10 above**, Kenyon et al. clearly show and disclose one or more associations between the selected object in the first computer space and the one or more first objects in the first computer space include an indirect association between the selected object and a particular first object, the indirect association including a direct association

Art Unit: 2443

between the selected object and an intervening first object and a direct association between the intervening first object and the particular first object (inherent from the teachings of Kenyon et al. since overlays are created which include concepts described by keywords and linked to objects which may in turn be linked to other concepts through similar association, thus it is possible for objects to be linked both directly and indirectly through their associations)(abstract, column 1 lines 46-49 lines 62-65, column 2 lines 52-54 lines 60-67, column 3 lines 1-10 lines 21-24, column 7 lines 4-24).

d) Consider **claim 6**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, Kenyon et al. clearly show and disclose the selected object and the first objects include computer files (digital information objects, documents, files)(abstract, column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49 lines 66-67, column 2 line 1, column 4 lines 3-6, column 8 lines 32-36).

e) Consider **claim 7**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, Kenyon et al. clearly show and disclose at least one of the first and second computer spaces corresponds to a computer memory store (inherent from the teachings of Kenyon et al. since a memory would be required to store WWW sites, emails, local documents, shared network files, presentation program files, spread sheets etc.)(column 8 lines 32-41).

f) Consider **claim 8**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, Kenyon et al. clearly show and disclose at least one of the first and second computer spaces corresponds to an accessible space of computer objects (abstract, column 1 lines 46-65, column 2 lines 52-54, column 8 lines 32-36) that are accessible by a user.

g) Consider **claim 9**, and **as applied to claim 1 above**, Kenyon et al. clearly shows and disclose the sharing includes copying the selected object from the first computer space to the second computer space (column 7 lines 10-15, column 8 lines 32-41).

Art Unit: 2443

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. **Claims 2, 5, 11, and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kenyon et al. (US Patent # US 6,792,430 B1)** in view of **Batty et al. (US Patent # US 6,223,212 B1)**.

a) Consider **claims 2 and 11**, and **as applied to claims 1 and 10 above**, Kenyon et al. clearly show and disclose storing in the first computer space association information relating to an association between the selected object and the second computer space (column 4 lines 3-8, column 7 lines 10-15) However, Kenyon et al. does not specifically disclose determining whether the association between the selected object and the second computer space is of an extent greater than a predetermined threshold; wherein the selected object is shared from the first computer space with

Art Unit: 2443

the second computer space upon a determination that the association between the selected object and the second computer space is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold.

Batty et al. discloses determining whether the association between the selected object and the second computer space is of an extent greater than a predetermined threshold (figure 2, column 2 lines 45-56, column 4 lines 8-18); wherein the selected object is shared from the first computer space with the second computer space upon a determination that the association between the selected object and the second computer space is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold (column 2 lines 56-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Batty et al. into the system of Kenyon et al. for the purpose of coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems (column 2 lines 42-44).

b) Consider **claims 5 and 14**, and **as applied to claims 1 and 10 above**, Kenyon et al. show and disclose the claimed invention. However, Kenyon et al. does not specifically disclose that at least one of the one or more associations is unidirectional between the selected object the one of the first objects.

Batty et al. show and disclose that one or more associations are unidirectional (Batty et al., figure 1, column 3 lines 66-67, column 4 lines 1-3 lines 33-40, column 5 lines 21-23) between the selected object the one of the first objects.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Batty et al. into the system of Kenyon et al. for the purpose of determining control over an application (column 4 lines 33-40).

Art Unit: 2443

8. **Claims 4 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kenyon et al. (US Patent # US 6,792,430 B1)** in view of **Batty et al. (US Patent # US 6,223,212, B1)** as applied to **claims 3 and 12** above, and further in view of **Hatori (US Patent Publication # US 2003/00221122 A1)**.

a) Consider **claims 4 and 13**, and as applied to **claims 3 and 12 above**, Kenyon et al. as modified by Batty et al. clearly shows and discloses the claimed invention except automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space the intervening first object, together with the direct association between the selected object and the intervening first object and the direct association between the intervening first object and the particular first object.

In the same field of endeavor, Hatori clearly shows and discloses a file sharing service (abstract, paragraph [0004], [0005], [0010]) that allows downloading files (paragraph [0053] paragraph [0054]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hatori into the teachings of Kenyon et al. as modified by Batty et al. for the purpose of sharing the intervening object together with the direct association between the first object and the particular object. Such a feature would have made the system of Kenyon et al. more efficient by not only sharing the indirect association between the first object and particular object but also sharing the intervening object and the direct associations between the first object and particular object that cause the indirect association to be made.

9. **Claims 15, 17, 19 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kenyon et al. (US Patent # US 6,792,430 B1)** in view of **Hatori (US Patent Publication # US 2003/00221122 A1)**.

Art Unit: 2443

a) Consider **claim 15**, Kenyon et al. clearly show and disclose, a method of sharing computer objects comprising: storing in a computer memory, association information relating to one or more associations (column 4 lines 3-8, column 7 lines 10-15) between a selected object in a first computer space and a second computer space, wherein the association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between the user and one or more objects in the first computer space (abstract, column 2 lines 14-24, column 3 lines 31-40, column 4 lines 11-23 lines 28-36, column 5 lines 26-30, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 16-24), and wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts or communications (digital information objects, documents, files)(abstract, column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49 lines 66-67, column 2 line 1, column 4 lines 3-6, column 8 lines 32-36); initiating sharing of the selected object (documents, emails, shared network files)(column 8 lines 32-36) from the first computer space with the second computer space. However, Kenyon et al. does not specifically disclose determining an extent of the association of the selected object with the second computer space; permitting sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if it is determined that the extend of association of the selected object with the second computer space is greater than a predetermined threshold; and interfering with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold.

Hatori shows and discloses file sharing service in which the sharing of files is terminated/disabled bases upon a predetermined security level (i.e. threshold) wherein, the service determines an extent of the association of the selected object with the second computer space (abstract, paragraph [0010] lines 1-7 lines 13-17, paragraph [0012], paragraph [0013], paragraph [0015], paragraph [0016], paragraph [0021]); permits sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if it is determined that the association of the selected object with the second

Art Unit: 2443

computer space is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold (abstract, paragraph [0010] lines 1-7 lines 13-17, paragraph [0013], paragraph [0015], paragraph [0016], paragraph [0021]); and interferes with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold (abstract, paragraph [0010] lines 1-7 lines 13-17, paragraph [0012], paragraph [0013], paragraph [0015], paragraph [0016], paragraph [0021]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hatori into the system of Kenyon et al. for the purpose of permitting/interfering with the sharing of a selected object based on a predetermined threshold for security reasons (paragraph [0021]). Such a feature would have made the overall system of Kenyon et al. more secure by limiting access based on a predetermined threshold.

b) Consider **claim 17**, and **as applied to claim 15 above**, Kenyon et al. as modified by Hatori clearly show and disclose, the method of claim 15 further including automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space an association (inherent from the teachings of Kenyon et al. since keywords defining overlays (i.e. associations) are contained in the document and they are transferred with the document when shared and the overlay is downloadable and can be made available globally)(Kenyon; column 5 lines 14-29, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 10-15) in the first computer space between the selected object and a first object that is in both the first computer space and the second computer space.

c) Consider **claim 19**, Kenyon et al. clearly show and disclose, computer readable storage media that facilitate forming context associations between first and second objects that are stored in computer memory and are associated with each other based on user computer interactions (abstract, column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49, lines 54-67, column 2 line 1, column 4 lines 3-8, column 5 lines 26-

Art Unit: 2443

29), the computer readable media, comprising: instructions for storing in memory association information relating to one or more associations (column 4 lines 3-8, column 7 lines 10-15) between a selected object in a first computer space and a second computer space, wherein the association information is determined automatically based upon prior interactions between the user and the objects (abstract, column 2 lines 14-24, column 3 lines 31-40, column 4 lines 11-23 lines 28-36, column 5 lines 26-30, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 16-24), and wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts and communications (digital information objects, documents, files)(abstract, column 1 lines 7-9 lines 46-49 lines 66-67, column 2 line 1, column 4 lines 3-6, column 8 lines 32-36). However, Kenyon et al does not specifically disclose instructions for determining whether the association of the selected object with the second computer space is of an extent greater than a predetermined threshold; instructions for permitting sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if it is determined that the association of the selected object with the second computer space is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold; and instructions for interfering with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold.

Hatori shows and discloses file sharing service in which the sharing of files is terminated/disabled based upon a predetermined security level (i.e. threshold) wherein, the service determines whether the association of the selected object with the second computer space is of an extent greater than a predetermined threshold (abstract, paragraph [0010] lines 1-7 lines 13-17, paragraph [0012], paragraph [0013], paragraph [0015], paragraph [0016], paragraph [0021]); permits sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if it is determined that the association of the selected object with the second computer space is of an extent greater than the predetermined

Art Unit: 2443

threshold (abstract, paragraph [0010] lines 1-7 lines 13-17, paragraph [0013], paragraph [0015], paragraph [0016], paragraph [0021]); and interferes with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold (abstract, paragraph [0010] lines 1-7 lines 13-17, paragraph [0012], paragraph [0013], paragraph [0015], paragraph [0016], paragraph [0021]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Hatori into the system of Kenyon et al. for the purpose of permitting/interfering with the sharing of a selected object based on a predetermined threshold for security reasons (paragraph [0021]). Such a feature would have made the overall system of Kenyon et al. more secure by limiting access based on a predetermined threshold.

d) Consider **claim 21**, and **as applied to claim 19 above**, Kenyon et al. as modified by Hatori clearly show and disclose, the medium of claim 19 further including instructions for automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space an association (inherent from the teachings of Kenyon et al. since keywords defining overlays (i.e. associations) are contained in the document and they are transferred with the document when shared and the overlay is downloadable and can be made available globally)(Kenyon; column 5 lines 14-29, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 10-15) in the first computer space between the selected object and a first object that is in both the first computer space and the second computer space.

Art Unit: 2443

10. **Claim 18** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kenyon et al. (US Patent # US 6,792,430 B1)** in view of **Hatori (US Patent Publication # US 2003/00221122 A1)** and further in view of **Batty et al. (US Patent # US 6,223,212, B1)**.

a) Consider **claim 18**, and **as applied to claim 17 above**, Kenyon et al. as modified by Hatori. However, Kenyon et al. as modified by Hatori does not specifically disclose that the association is unidirectional between the selected object the first object.

Batty et al. show and disclose that one or more associations are unidirectional (figure 1, column 3 lines 66-67, column 4 lines 1-3 lines 33-40, column 5 lines 21-23) between the selected object the one of the first objects.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Batty et al. into the system of Kenyon et al. as modified by Hatori for the purpose of determining control over an application (column 4 lines 33-40).

11. **Claim 22** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kenyon et al. (US Patent # US 6,792,430 B1)** in view of **Hatori (US Patent Publication # US 2003/00221122 A1)** and further in view of **Farnham et al. (US Patent # US 7,343,365 B2)**.

a) Consider **claim 22**, and **as applied to claim 15 above**, Kenyon et al. as modified by Hatori et al. clearly show and disclose, the method of claim 15, determining the extent of association between the selected object and the second computer space (abstract, paragraph [0010] lines 1-7 lines 13-17, paragraph [0013], paragraph [0015], paragraph [0016], paragraph [0021]). However, Kenyon et al. as modified by Hatori et al. does not specifically disclose the extent of association between the selected object and the second computer space is determined based on at least on an

Art Unit: 2443

extent of association between the selected object and a user associated with the second computer space.

Farnham et al. show and disclose an automatic context association system that identifies associations between computer objects and accesses them based in accordance with user context, wherein extent of association is determined based on at least on an extent of association between the selected object and a user associated with the second computer space (abstract, column 2 lines 1-4, column 3 lines 32-45 lines 54-58 lines 66-67, column 4 lines 1-10 lines 51-67, column 5 lines 36-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the time the invention was made to incorporate determining an extent of association between the selected object and a user, as taught by, Farnham et al. into the system of Kenyon et al. as modified by Hatori et al. for the purpose of determining access to objects based on the extent of a user's association with the object (Farnham; column 3 lines 32-39).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 23FEB2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Kenyon does not teach "...the second computer space including one or more second objects' that match the one or more first objects." or "execute the step of identifying the one or more second objects' in the second computer space nor does it teach or suggest automatically forming one or more associations between the selected object and the second objects' preexisting in the second computer space upon the sharing of the selected object and the association information from the first computer space to the second computer space."

Art Unit: 2443

The Examiner respectfully disagrees; Kenyon clearly discloses sharing the selected object (documents, emails, shared network files)(column 8 lines 32-36) and the association information from the first computer space with a second computer space, the second computer space including one or more of the second objects that match the one or more first objects (column 1 lines 62-65, column 3 lines 34-40, column 7 lines 10-15). Kenyon clearly discloses a system for creating associative links between computer objects (documents, emails, shared network files) and that those links be shared in the form of an overlay between computer spaces by the user. When the first user shares the overlay (i.e. the associative links) with second user it creates the same links that were on the first user's computer on the second user's computer; this would necessarily require matching files to be present on the second computer space. Kenyon uses the example where a user wants to create a associative trail though a group of addressable objects in order to share with a second user and aid in the second user's navigation through the same files (column 3 lines 20-40, column 7 lines 10-24). This would only work if the second user had the same files in the second computer space.

Kenyon clearly discloses identifying in the second computer space the one or more second objects in the second computer space (column 1 lines 62-65, column 3 lines 34-40, column 5 lines 14-29, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 10-15). Kenyon clearly discloses the selection of objects (documents, emails, shared network files) and the creation of links (association) between those objects; clearly the objects need to be identified before the links can be made. Furthermore, Kenyon discloses addressable objects (column 2 lines 52-67, column 3 1-16 lines 20-24, among others) and the navigation of addressable objects which again requires that the objects are identified.

Kenyon clearly discloses automatically forming the one or more associations (inherent from the teachings of Kenyon et al. since keywords defining overlays (i.e. associations) are contained in the document and they are transferred with the document when shared and the overlay is

Art Unit: 2443

downloadable and can be made available globally)(column 5 lines 14-29, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 10-15) between the selected object and the second objects preexisting in the second computer space upon the sharing of the selected object and the association information from the first computer space to the second computer space (column 3 lines 34-40, column 5 lines 14-29, column 6 lines 59-66, column 7 lines 10-15). Kenyon clearly discloses creating associations between computer objects (documents, emails, shared network files), and that those associations are embedded in the objects, and that those associations can be shared between computer spaces. Furthermore, Kenyon clearly discloses that when the first user shares the overlay (i.e. the associative links) with second user it creates the same links that were on the first user's computer on the second user's computer; this would necessarily require those files to be present (i.e. preexisting) on the second computer space.

Applicant argues that "[I]t is erroneously contended on page 9 of the Final Office Action dated October 3, 2008 that Hatori discloses a file sharing device." and that "Hatori fails to teach or suggest automatically forming one or more associations between the selected object and the second objects' preexisting in the second computer space upon the sharing of the selected object and the association information from the first computer space to the second computer space."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees; in response to Applicant's argument that Hatori does not disclose a file sharing device, a file sharing device is a device capable of sharing files. Hatori clearly discloses a device (PC, PDA, computer, etc.) capable of starting, stopping, and controlling the sharing of files (e.g. running a file sharing service)(paragraph [0014], [0015], [0016]), therefore, Hatori clearly discloses a file sharing device.

In response to Applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations

Art Unit: 2443

of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant argues that Hatori fails to teach or suggest automatically forming one or more associations between the selected object and the second objects' preexisting in the second computer space upon the sharing of the selected object and the association information from the first computer space to the second computer space. Hatori was not intended to teach or cited as teaching the aforementioned claim feature(s). Kenyon, however, was intended to teach the aforementioned claim feature(s) as clearly cited in the Office Action and as detailed in the response above.

Applicant argues with respect to independent claim 15 (and similarly independent claim 19) that Hatori fails to teach "determining an extent of the association of the selected object with the second computer space and permitting sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if it is determined that the extend of association of the selected object with the second computer space is greater than a predetermined threshold; and interfering with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees; Hatori clearly discloses a file sharing system (see arguments above)(abstract, paragraph [0004], [0005], [0010], [0014], [0015], [0016]) in which the sharing of files is terminated/disabled bases upon a predetermined security level (i.e. threshold) wherein the service determines whether the association of the selected object with the second computer space is of an extent greater than a predetermined threshold (abstract, paragraph [0010] lines 1-7 lines 13-17, paragraph [0012], paragraph [0013], paragraph [0021]); and interferes with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold

Art Unit: 2443

(abstract, paragraph [0010] lines 1-7 lines 13-17, paragraph [0012], paragraph [0013], paragraph [0021]). In other words, if association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold (i.e. security level) then the system interferes with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space (i.e. the sharing of files is terminated or disabled).

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- | | |
|-------------|----------------------|
| ➤ 5,159,669 | ➤ US 2005/0256842 A1 |
| ➤ 4,868,733 | ➤ US 2008/0313302 A1 |
| ➤ 5,602,985 | ➤ US 2003/0156138 A1 |
| ➤ 5,684,969 | ➤ US 2009/0055426 A1 |

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL C. MURRAY whose telephone number is 571-270-1773. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 0800-1700 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia Dollinger can be reached on (571)-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2443

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DCM/

Examiner, Art Unit 2443

/Tonia LM Dollinger/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2443